1			
1	JOHN A. YANCHUNIS (pro hac vice)	Clayeo C. Arnold, SBN 65070	
2	jyanchunis@forthepeople.com	carnold@justice4you.com	
3	RYAN J. McGEE ( <i>pro hac vice</i> ) rmcgee@forthepeople.com	Joshua H. Watson, SBN 238058 jwatson@justice4you.com	
4	MORGAN & MORGAN COMPLEX LITIGATION GROUP	CLAYEO C. ARNOLD A PROFESSIONAL LAW	
5	201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor	CORPORATION	
6	Tampa, Florida 33602 Telephone: (813) 223-5505	865 Howe Avenue Sacramento, California 95825	
7	Facsimile: (813) 223-5402	Telephone: (916) 777-7777	
8		Facsimile: (916) 924-1829	
9			
10	FRANKLIN D. AZAR (pro hac vice)		
11	azarf@fdazar.com MARGEAUX R. AZAR (pro hac vice)		
12	azarm@fdazar.com FRANKLIN D. AZAR & ASSOCIATES	SPC	
13	14426 East Evans Avenue	, 1.0.	
14	Aurora, Colorado 80014 Telephone: (303) 757-3300		
15	Facsimile: (720) 213-5131		
16	Appointed Class Counsel		
17			
18	LINITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT	
	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
19	SAN JOSE DIVISION		
20			
21	IN RE GOOGLE PLUS PROFILE LITIGATION	) No. 5:18-CV-06164 (VKD) ) <b>JOINT MOTION FOR INDICATIVE</b>	
22		) RULING AS TO WHETHER COURT ) WILL APPROVE SETTLEMENT WITH	
23		) OBJECTOR	
24		) Date: ) Time: .	
25		Courtroom:	
26		Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila	
27		/	
28			

8 9 10

12

11

1314

1516

17

18

1920

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e)(5)(B)(ii) and 62.1, Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by and through their undersigned counsel ("Plaintiffs"), and *pro se* Objector-Appellant Steven Davis jointly move for an indicative ruling whether, upon remand from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, the Court would approve a stipulation and agreement of settlement reached between them. If the agreement is approved, Davis would agree to dismiss with prejudice his appeal.

Rule 23(e)(5) permits class members to object to proposed class action settlements and requires court approval of any payment in connection with "forgoing, dismissing, or abandoning an appeal from a judgment approving" a settlement. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(5)(A)-(B)(ii). If the parties do not obtain such approval "before an appeal has been docketed in the court of appeals, the procedure of Rule 62.1 applies while the appeal remains pending." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e)(5)(C). Rule 62.1 permits the court to make an indicative ruling when the court lacks authority to grant a motion because an appeal has been taken. Fed. R. Civ. P. 62.1(a)(3).

Under the afore-mentioned agreement, Class Counsel and the Plaintiffs have agreed to do the following:

- 1. Write a letter to the Northern District of California's Local Rules Committee proposing certain modifications to the class action settlement guidelines;
- 2. Return \$100,000.00 of the attorneys' fees award instead of \$130,000.00 to the Class based on time spent on the mediation and settlement; and
- 3. Pay \$800 to cover the Objector-Appellant's costs on appeal.

The proposed agreement would be in the best interest of the Settlement Class, which was approved by this Court. While Plaintiffs continue to maintain that the appeal lacks merit, the proposed agreement will allow the appeal to be resolved, thereby making the Class Settlement final and expedite payment to the Settlement Class. The agreement was reached through arm's

## Case 5:18-cv-06164-EJD Document 118 Filed 04/23/21 Page 3 of 5

1	length negotiations between Plaintiffs' and Objector-Appellant as a result of a medi	ation
2	conducted by Ninth Circuit Mediator Kay Suk, and was not the product of coercion or inducer	ment.
3	Should the Court state that it would grant the motion upon remand, Plaintiffs will n	otify
4	the chean clerk of the 14mm cheant, in accordance with reals 52.1(b) and reactar real	le of
5	Appellate Procedure 12.1, and seek remand of the case to this Court so the motion can be gra	nted.
6 7	Based on the foregoing, Plaintiffs and Objector-Appellant respectfully request that	it the
8	Court indicate whether it would approve of their agreement and stipulation.	
9	Dated: April 23, 2021 /s/ John A. Yanchunis	
10	JOHN A. YANCHUNIS ( <i>pro hac vice</i> jyanchunis@forthepeople.com	)
11	RYAN J. McGEE (pro hac vice)	
12	rmcgee@forthepeople.com  MORGAN & MORGAN	
13	COMPLEX LITIGATION GROUP	
	Tampa Florida 33602	
14	Telephone: (813) 223-5505	
15	Facsimile: (813) 223-5402	
16		
17	carnold@justice4you.com	
	joshua H. Watson, SDN 250050	
18	CLAYEO C. ARNOLD	
19		
20	CORPORATION 965 Howe Avenue	
	Sacramento California 95825	
21	Telephone: (916) 777-7777	
22	F	
23		
24	azarf@fdazar.com MARGEAUX R. AZAR ( <i>pro hac vice</i>	)
	azarm@fdazar.com	,
25	P. C.	ES,
26	14426 East Evans Avenue	
27		
28	Telephone: (303) 757-3300	
ا ۵	JOINT MOTION FOR INDICATIVE RULING AS TO WHETHER COURT WILL APPROVE SETTLEMENT WITH OBJECTOR	

CASE NO: 5:18-CV-06164-EJD

- 2

## Case 5:18-cv-06164-EJD Document 118 Filed 04/23/21 Page 4 of 5

Facsimile: (720) 213-5131 Appointed Class Counsel /s/ Steven Davis Steven Davis steven Davis stevendavis@yahoo.com 734 Syracuse Ave., Apt. 2N University City, MO 63130 Telephone: (913) 683-3719 Facsimile: (913) 273-0100 Objector-Appellant, Pro Se 

JOINT MOTION FOR INDICATIVE RULING AS TO WHETHER COURT WILL APPROVE SETTLEMENT WITH OBJECTOR CASE NO: 5:18-CV-06164-EJD

## **SIGNATURE ATTESTATION**

I am the ECF User whose identification and password are being used to file this Joint Motion for Indicative Ruling as to Whether Court Will Approve Settlement with Objector.

Executed on April 23, 2021.

/s/ John A. Yanchunis

John A. Yanchunis